

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/442,685	11/18/1999	BOBBY MAL PHILLIPS	70493-(US06)	6259
21878	7590 07/26/2002	•		
KENNEDY COVINGTON LOBDELL & HICKMAN, LLP 100 N TRYON STREET BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATE CENTER CHARLOTTE. NC 28202-4006			EXAMINER	
			WATKINS III, WILLIAM P	
CHARLOTT	E, NC 26202-4000		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	14
			DATE MAILED: 07/26/2002	<b>, ,</b>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-14	
Fr	
ddress	
NCE. eply to a cation in or Continued	
whichever is later. In ection. N. See MPEP	
opropriate extension ppropriate extension nal Office action; or ejection, even if	
);	
simplifying the	
ims.	
ed amendment	
IOT place the	
ere newly	
d and an	

## **Advisory Action**

Application N .	Applicant	(s)	
09/442,685	PHILLIPS	ET AL.	
Examin r	Art Unit		
William P. Watkins III	1772		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communicati n appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence a

THE REPLY FILED 11 July 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWAN Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper refinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the applic condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant argues that suitable fibers are SW173 which are crimped, Osborn, III et al. also lists at col. 7, lines 30-35 the fibers of WO 93/02235 (already of record) which teaches at page 41, lines 5-15 the use of substantially parallel fibers in a tow.

Continuation of 10. Other: In the event of an appeal, the rejection will be rewritten to take into account applicant's amendment of a dependent limitation into the base claim, using the arguments advanced by the examiner, already of record, regarding this limitation. This will not be considered as a new grounds of rejection by the examiner.

WILLIAM P. WATKINS III PRIMARY EXAMINER

Millien P. Wheathusto -